

Remarks

Claims 1-50 are pending, and claims 1-50 stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1-50.

Claim 24 is objected to for being dependent on an incorrect base claim. Claim 24 has been amended and claim 24 now depends from claim 21.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 6,327,346 (Infosino). Claim 1 is reproduced below (emphasis added):

1. A method of operating a voice recognition system, the method comprising:
 - receiving a first signal indicating a first user ID for a first user into a first device;
 - transferring a second signal indicating a first device ID for the first device and indicating the first user ID to a processing system;
 - in the processing system, obtaining a first device voice recognition profile based on the first device ID and obtaining a first user voice recognition profile based on the first user ID;
 - in the processing system, generating a first set of voice recognition data customized for the first device and the first user based on the first device voice recognition profile and the first user voice recognition profile;
 - transferring a third signal indicating the first set of the voice recognition data from the processing system to the first device;
 - in the first device, indicating voice command readiness in response to the first set of the voice recognition data;
 - receiving a first voice command from the first user into the first device;
 - and
 - in the first device, translating the first voice command based on the first set of the voice recognition data.

Claim 1 requires “generating a first set of voice recognition data customized for the first device”. The control system in Infosino does not generate voice recognition data to send to the first device. In the current application, voice recognition data is used to translate the voice commands into signals indicating the commands during voice recognition (page 16, lines 2 – 4). The voice recognition data is consistent with the capabilities and protocols used by the device. Typically this would resolve differences in sampling rates, encoding methods, or command terminology (page 19 lines 4 – 15). The controller in Infosino determines communication

settings and sends "command signals to set the communication parameters of the communication device" (column 5, lines 50 -54). The settings may be a volume level, enabling/disabling call waiting, etc.... (column 3 lines 43 – 50). The commands are not voice recognition data used to aid the voice recognition process occurring in the first device as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 also requires that the voice commands are translated in the first device based on the downloaded voice recognition data. Infosino does not do voice recognition in the first device. All the voice recognition in Infosino is done in the control system (column 3 lines 29 – 50). Because Infosino does not do the voice recognition in the first device, the voice recognition can not be based on the voice recognition data as required by claim 1.

Based on the above comments, the Applicants submit that the examiner has not met the requirements for a *prima facie* case of anticipation and claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claims 2 – 10 are dependent on allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

Claim 11 also requires that the first device receives voice recognition data and translates a voice command based on the received voice recognition data. Therefore the argument for claim 1 applies and claim 11 is allowable as written.

Claims 12 – 20 are dependent on allowable claim 11 and are therefore allowable.

Claim 21 also requires generating voice recognition data and sending the voice recognition data to the first device. Therefore the argument for claim 1 applies and claim 21 is allowable as written.

Claims 22 – 30 are dependent on allowable claim 21 and are therefore allowable.

Claim 31 also requires generating voice recognition data and sending the voice recognition data to the first device. Therefore the argument for claim 1 applies and claim 31 is allowable as written.

Claims 32 – 40 are dependent on allowable claim 31 and are therefore allowable.

Claim 41 also requires generating voice recognition data and sending the voice recognition data to the first device. Therefore the argument for claim 1 applies and claim 31 is allowable as written.

Claims 42 – 50 are dependent on allowable claim 41 and are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1-50 are allowable. There may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-50.

Any fees may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/28/06



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100